EXHIBIT 57

Message

From:	Scott Spencer [scottspencer@google.com]
Sent:	2/2/2011 6:10:36 PM
To:	Jonathan Bellack [jbellack@google.com]; Guillaume Ryder [gryder@google.com]
CC:	Robby Stein [robby@google.com]; Michael Guntsch [mgu@google.com]; Jacob Baskin [jbaskin@google.com]; Yufan Zhu (朱玉凡) [yzhu@google.com]; Fedor Labounko [fedya@google.com]; Ola Abiri [oabiri@google.com]; Nemo Semret [nemozen@google.com]; Matt Clark [mattclark@google.com]; Bart Govaert [bartgovaert@google.com]; Vincent Zanotti [vzanotti@google.com]; Allan Livingston [allanl@google.com]; Rahul Bafna [rbafna@google.com]; Eyal Manor [emanor@google.com]; David Singleton [davidsingleton@google.com]; Clayton Bavor Jr. [cwb@google.com]
Subject:	Re: Update on AdX YM: Client feedback and Latest Progress

Guillaume,

Hopefully today's session helped answer many of these questions. Some great questions were posed and I think it was very useful to hear all the different perspectives and options.

Additional thoughts / documenting some of the items from today's meeting for the broader team in-line.

Regards,
-scott

From: Jonathan Bellack <jbellack@google.com>
Date: Wed, 2 Feb 2011 10:50:21 -0500
To: Guillaume Ryder <gryder@google.com>
Cc: Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com>, Robby Stein <robby@google.com>, Michael Guntsch <mgu@google.com>, Jacob Baskin <jbaskin@google.com>, "Yufan Zhu (朱玉凡)" <yzhu@google.com>, Fedor Labounko <fedya@google.com>, Ola Abiri <oabiri@google.com>, Nemo Semret <nemozen@google.com>, Matt Clark <mattclark@google.com>, Bart Govaert <bartgovaert@google.com>, Vincent Zanotti <vzanotti@google.com>, Allan Livingston <allanl@google.com>, Rahul Bafna <rbafna@google.com>, Eyal Manor <emanor@google.com>, David Singleton <davidsingleton@google.com>, "Clayton Bavor Jr." <cwb@google.com>
Subject: Re: Update on AdX YM: Client feedback and Latest Progress

Hi, Guillaume. I've added some answers below on the mission -- Scott & Robby can help with answers to the managed networks area.

-- Jonathan Bellack
Product Management Director, Publisher Ad Platforms
jbellack@google.com
+1 212-381-5443

On Wed, Feb 2, 2011 at 10:05 AM, Guillaume Ryder <gryder@google.com> wrote:
Scott, Jonathan, and Robby: thanks for having taken the time to write these very detailed responses, and for the attached material. These insights and the managed buys meeting Robby scheduled for today are greatly appreciated, especially as ASFE was introduced to the YM problematic only recently.

I apologize for the large number of questions below, and the turnaround time; a lot of catch up needs to be done before I'm in a position to give actionable feedback. Hopefully most of these questions have simple answers and we can move on.

Managed networks strategy
We will have all of today's meeting to discuss this in details; my preliminary questions would be:

1. How did we interpret publisher feedback about fixed CPM on "Competition" and "Would they use it"? Specifically:

   ○ Are pubs saying they would still use yield managers?

There are many features we need to develop in order to earn 100% of a publisher's inventory. The fixed CPM feature is a necessary, but not sufficient step in this process. As discussed, we are working to develop the basic kernel first so that we can extend it into the other use cases we need to cover.

   ○ Are these pubs representative of the ones we fear could defect to yield managers?

The publishers with which we reviewed the design in NY were selected as representative. Some work with other yield managers today, some do not. Interestingly, there are many different ways that publishers manage their business so there are some areas where there isn't yet market consensus.

- What's the expected impact of managed buys v1 on pubs attrition, given that the feedback seems to put the bar rather high?

Developing the initial "core" will solve some use cases. More importantly, it's requires to address the next level of use cases.

1. What's the business impact of exposing by-advertiser data so publishers can cut direct deals with top spenders?

- When publishers locate top advertisers and sign a direct deal with them, we lose revenue since inventory & traffic leave the auction. How much do we care? Do we have a solution for keeping these direct advertisers & corresponding inventory flowing through Google?

By creating a means to manage the advertiser level via fixed price relationships, we stand to gain the most in terms of reclaiming transactions via AdX / google.

- Are networks willing to share by-advertiser information? In other words, will the feature target mostly AdWords advertisers, attacking our core display revenue?

There are ways to incentivize the sharing of this data. One idea from Jacob B. is to modify the auction logic so that advertisers won't compete against themselves regardless of the buyer they come through. This creates an incentive for declaration and, most interestingly, declaration against a single, standardized list.

Mission statement (go/ym-mission) & long-term vision
The mission statement happens to be the document I linked to in question #3; nice to see it has a simple go link :)
Main thoughts after a more careful second read; they probably sound naive and candid, but I'd be curious to know our position about:

1. **Integration into XFP**

I'm not sure to understand the plan and the timeline. In "long-term implementation", are we talking about re-implementing the short-term implementation in XFP? What does "based on XFP technology" mean?

Publishers fundamentally believe they get maximum yield through a broad mix of deal types -- sponsorships, direct sold deals of CPM, CPC, or CPA type, direct network relationships for a fixed price with companies like Ad.com or AdLink, deals with revenue share networks like AdSense & other networks like it, private auctions with agency trading desks like Vivaki, cherry-picking deals with retargeting networks like Criteo in Europe, open auctions with real-time bidding, etc. Right now a publisher has to use three totally separate products to cover all these deal types. DFP/XFP covers some of them, AdX covers some others, and there are still others which neither DFP/XFP nor AdX does well but the Yield Managers support better. The long-term strategy is to let a publisher have a reasonably unified Google Yield Management experience, where all these deal types can be managed in a consistent way with unified reporting on everything. This unified experience will start in the XFP FE, with AdX as an "ingredient brand" powering some number of these deal types but not 100% of them. Note that this is *NOT* a technical goal -- nobody is suggesting we re-implement AdXFE in XFP code base. But there is a lot we can do to make the two experiences feel more consistent. (Simple example = when you create an AdX line item in XFP, there should be a deep link to the matching ad slot in AdX; and vice versa in AdX FE you should be able to follow a link to see all the XFP line items that map to it.)

That said, you also correctly point out that there is some overlap as to whether some deal types should be handled by XFP serving or AdX serving. Managed networks does fall into that grey area -- XFP already supports "price priority" line items for which a publisher can enter a fixed price, which will then compete with real-time bids from AdX; but it doesn't allow for passback (buyer deciding they don't want the impression i.e. not bidding). And as we know most large publishers are still on DART, plus at least 40% of display impressions in the world are not on DFP/XFP. This all means to make an impact in the market sooner, we need to enhance what AdX can do. You do ask very valid questions about focusing on which AdX features will move the most volume. Michelle Sarlo has done a great job setting out key metrics for AdX, namely 1) saturation rate (# impressions available to AdX), 2) match rate (# impressions available to AdX that AdX wins), and 3) CPM (value of impressions).

1. Timeline: when will XFP work start? My understanding was that the XFP team would not be able to dedicate significant resources to yield management before at least two years. Is that accurate? If yes, given that yield managers will not sit idle for 2+ years as strongly hinted by client feedback, what's our strategy to converge to an attractive solution soon enough -- say, within 1-2 years max?

XFP work has started -- Steve Rupp and Arun Mathew have put together a good team that is starting to work on XFP Yield Management. So far we have been keeping the AdX/YM and XFP/YM work streams separate, so each team can focus on fast delivery and not lose time on synchronization when things are just getting started. The first two projects for XFP/YM are 1) a Yield Report that shows impressions and revenues by every ad type in XFP (sponsorships, standard, network, etc as well as AdSense + AdX), and 2) an API to allow publishers to import revenue data from non-RTB networks. This is still a large percentage of every publisher's business which the standalone Yield Managers can handle.

1.
Danger: the more XFP-like features we implement in AdX and its current frontend, the more we will have to catch up when migrating AdX to XFP. In particular, it's easy to diverge from XFP and make future migration more difficult if the team is not kept in the loop of managed buys discussions. How do we balance short-term wins vs. long-term awesomeness?

There is no plan to migrate AdX to XFP in the near term, IMHO slowing down to do that would be quite harmful. Instead I see it as an "ingredient brand" as mentioned above -- there would be connection points that make it easier to move between XFP and AdX FEs,

and possibly some look and feel convergence so they feel more like components of an overall Google YM solution. Put more simply, using XFP+AdX together should work much better than using any other ad server or yield manager together.

The one area where I could see more overlap is in reporting, since XFP already does more granular segmentation that is starting now for AdX. But Steve Rupp tells me there is already a healthy eng discussion about sharing work between LON and NYC reporting teams, so that could play out as it goes.

For the key question of short-term wins vs. long-term awesomeness, the Yield Managers are winning in the market right now and signing up most of our large publishers. It is really, really urgent that we make *some* improvements to AdX in the very near term (Q1/Q2/Q3 2011) or else we may fall so far behind it will be really hard to catch up no matter how much awesomeness we eventually deliver. In effect the AdX YM work now is the bet on short-term wins, and the XFP YM work is the bet on long-term awesomeness. (If all we wanted was short-term wins we'd put everything into AdX; if all we wanted was long-term awesomeness we would put everything into XFP.) That said, since AdX FE and AdX RTB system will exist forever, investment in those areas is also a long-term benefit too.

1.

In a nutshell: the short-term solution seems to be more like medium-term in practice. Do we want to update the plan accordingly?

IMHO certainly the current bias in LON should be on projects which can be delivered to publishers as early in 2011 as possible.

1.

2. **Overlap**

Even if we forget about the re-implementation danger and assume we have achieved the plan, there will still be overlap between XFP direct deals and YM direct network relationships. Because YM can be stand-alone, direct network relationships cannot be exclusively in XFP. But XFP users will want to have them integrated there. Without drilling into the eng details, what's our vision about which piece should go where?

The vision is that the Google Yield Manager home screen will be an XFP screen, with some kind of screen to choose deal types, some of which are filled by XFP and others by AdX. The publisher should not need to care (or even know) which technology is fulfilling the ad, because it should be a smooth connection between the two. (Again, *not* rebuilding AdXFE into XFP, because that would take a long time and not deliver very little incremental publisher benefit compared to just improving deep links, common look & feel, plus some unified reporting.)

If a publisher is already using XFP, Yield Manager will appear as a module in XFP (maybe its own tab). If a publisher is not using XFP, Yield Manager will appear as a flavor of XFP with any unsupported direct selling features disabled. (Imagine a version of XFP that did not support sponsorships or direct CPM sales and had no access to Ninjafire reservations forecasting.) This is very much equivalent to what the Yield Managers offer -- they have a RTB system that has some very basic support for other deal types built in.

1.

2. **Segmentation**

The two axis of the table make perfect sense, however I'm wondering if we should expose it to publishers and enforce it with eng implementation. Ideally, publishers would have one platform/frontend to go to, and only enable/disable modules as they/we see fit. In other words: features (options), not products (silos). I know this goal is unrealistic for a few years, but is it our long-term objective? If not, do we explicitly want to keep our offering fragmented into multiple distinct products?

I like the idea that XFP2 and ASFE4 would share a common inventory model & maybe even codebase. I do not see that as an urgent project by any means, though, since both teams are in the final stages of a very successful rollout of XFP1 and ASFE3.

1.

In addition to eng impact (less frontends to maintain) and obvious advantages for users, this vision has a business impact. Migrations and experimentations would be much easier, and we could charge users on a per-feature basis with a single contract. We could tell publishers: "we'll let you try module X for N days: it's easy, no re-tagging or migration needed". Has this been considered?

Yes, but based on the negative outcome of the inventory convergence investigation last year (large effort / minimal benefit) the discussion was to put off deep convergence until that future XFP2/ASFE4 project. You do raise a good point about tagging though -- it certainly seems like a good project to figure out how to let one set of tags work for AdSense, AdX, or XFP without changes.

1.

2. **Convergence to an all-auction market**

I guess that auction pressure is best for the market -- and us --, while direct or managed deals go against this by 1) somewhat artificially increasing prices of inventory targeted in a rather crude way; 2) removing inventory and traffic from us and the market. Is this understanding accurate?

If yes, it conflicts with some objectives of yield management, in particular giving insights to publishers so they can cut direct deals with top advertisers. Have we taken an explicit business decision about this?

In effect that was our past strategy -- to tell publishers the auction is best so they should stop doing other types of deals. The past four years have shown that publishers are firmly committed to running a wide range of deal types and auction alone is not acceptable to them, and they have voted with their feet to ad servers and yield managers. That is why we changed strategy to build broader deal

support & services. The unique advantage that we can offer which nobody else can is that we can do intelligent yield advice across *ALL* deal types including direct sales of sponsorships and CPM deals. Nobody else can do that, and it means we can give intelligent advice that I feel will help us in the long run. For example, if a publisher is spending a lot of effort direct selling deals worth only $1 or $2, total yield management means we could show them that they could make nearly as much money through the Google auction, and save all the overhead costs of selling and trafficking their own deals.

1.

2. **Advertisers' interest**

Where do advertisers, specifically AdWords, fit in the YM plan?
I know that YM, AdX, and other yield managers want to give power back to publishers. But how did we balance that against advertisers' interests? In particular:

1) Is it in the best interest of advertisers to cut (expensive?) direct deals with publishers, as opposed to participate to a public auction? Does AdWords have medium-term plans to provide targeting tools to advertisers that make some direct deals irrelevant? For instance, if advertisers can target a category anonymously + add audience constraints, the value add of a direct deals erodes. How far are we from this situation?

Several answers:
1) many ad networks like cutting direct deals as they feel it benefits them -- they get first look at the best inventory instead of having to compete openly.
2) publishers perceive that current AdSense and AdX are actually biased toward advertisers already -- for example advertisers can know what site they advertise on (through placements or branded listings in AdX), but we give publishers zero visibility into what advertisers are running. (We do it piecemeal in ARC but do not provide a complete list in one place or any reporting data on it.) Publishers are voting with their feet by seeking out companies that give publishers a more favorable position in the market. If publishers leave AdSense/AdX, it hurts Google (less money), publishers (less auction pressure on the pubs that remain), and ultimately advertisers will buy elsewhere. Proof point = Invite Media who helps buyers place bids across multiple RTB systems like AdX and the yield managers reports that the yield managers' RTB systems are on a much faster growth rate than AdX. We are losing that volume because the yield managers do a better job meeting publisher needs.

Arun Mathew put the value of direct negotiations well -- in effect the information transmitted from the publisher to the advertiser during the negotiation process holds value. Removing that and going through an auction eliminates that value. Proof = Demand Media runs most of their auction business through Right Media exchange instead of AdX, because Right Media lets them negotiate terms directly with buyers, and they feel strongly that helps them get higher bids & better results.

1.

2) From a technical point of view, min RPM optimization and the way min RPM is implemented moves the auction towards a first-price model. We can set up safeguards, but basically big publishers want first-price auction, while most of small AdSense pubs are still in pure second-price. It means that big pubs having access to min RPM controls have an advantage over the other publishers. Advertisers may not realize that they are paying more for AdX traffic, and AdWords algorithms may not take the first-price skew into account, so big publishers would benefit from their small number and advanced control to capture more advertisers' dollars. Are we and AdWords aware of this possibility? Have we evaluated the risk? How far are we willing to go to get more publishers on board?

Interesting question. Few thoughts:
1 - this is not about evaluating a new opportunity to get more publishers on board relative to a safe/stable baseline position -- this is a reaction to a strong move in the market away from just AdSense/just AdX toward Yield Managers. If we do not take some action we will lose more business.
2 - AdX is going to end up available to more publishers over time. The sales reorg means Scott Sheffer & Christina Wire's team are now responsible for AdX, AdSense, and DFP/XFP for all publishers in North America except the top 300, and they have reported a lot of interest from the larger tier 1 publishers in Yield Management type functionality. Casey Saran is a good example, he came from Weather Underground who is a large AdSense publisher but in reality actually does their own Yield Management between multiple networks. That team offering AdX means we actually have the chance to win more business by getting pubs using AdSense + other things to run more of it through AdX and the eventual XFP YM.
3 - while the long tail is the majority of AdSense pubs by number, the majority of revenue is actually with the larger publishers (tier 1 and Direct).

1.

Guillaume

On Tue, Feb 1, 2011 at 02:46, Jonathan Bellack <jbellack@google.com> wrote:
Guillaume, also take a look at go/ym-mission -- that's the Joerg/Neal-approved plan for Yield Management, which includes a view of how the short-term AdX work and long-term XFP work are designed to come together into a single YM solution. You hit on a very pertinent point (the similarities between managed networks and DFP line items) which Scott and I attempted to resolve through the

go/ym-mission plan. Take a look and see if you think we got it, or where we should continue to refine that plan.

– Jonathan Bellack
Product Management Director, Publisher Ad Platforms
jbellack@google.com
+1 212-381-5443

2011/1/31 Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com>

Thanks for this Guillaume. Great feedback and thought.

Sorry for a long reply to this, but I wanted to give the team some background on how we got to managed networks in the first place.

Before replying to the particular questions, I think it's important to take a step back and share some background with the team on how we got to the set of development priorities we are focusing on. Throughout Q4, a cross functional team that included global sales, services, engineering and product has worked together to develop an 2011 business plan for the exchange (attached). It's important to note that, while we would like to include everyone in such a process, it's not really feasible, but the process did include Laurent Cordier and Tanzil Bukari from EMEA sales and Eyal Manor and Fran Ryan from engineering as representatives.

This business plan looks at the aggregate market, competitors, and customer needs as guideposts for prioritizing the development. Through this process, we were able to articulate that "yield management" as a concept was a critical threat to the exchange and that we need to focus our efforts to address the use cases that are causing customers to defect to the likes of Pubmatic, Rubicon and AdMeld. More specifically, within Yield Management, we identified that managed networks, reporting and optimization we key features for clients. These are not all we found, however. We also identified, as Allan did, that there are EMEA specific needs such as the 3rd party dynamic allocation API and better sub-syndicate management. The team then went through and prioritized each development item in order to come up with the baseline roadmap documented at go/adxroadmap.

This is not to say that new feedback won't (or shouldn't) involve our plans. I just wanted to give the team a bit of insight into the process that has helped us identify the key needs for 2011.

Now, drilling down into the specific questions you raise on managed buys.

In addition to the 9 meetings that Robby has summarized, Jonathan and I spend time with some key publishers to understand specifically, what would Google need to provide you (in XFP or AdX) in order to get a given client to move off of [Rubicon / Pubmatic / AdMeld] and completely onto a Google solution? The common thread to the responses was that we needed to provide a way to address the one-to-one relationships that these publishers maintained with given networks that were not bidded while providing all the supporting elements (reporting, ARC, advertiser blocking, RTB buying) that they got when they had a traditional AdX bidded relationship with a buyer. This is what became the "managed network" buys – a way to manage a one-to-one relationship where the publisher was controlling the price and terms of the deal via AdX.

In terms of how we implement this, there are many different design directions we could take and I think we should think through as many of them as we can. I also want to make sure that we provide some basic functionality sooner rather than later as we are continuing to lose share to these competitors for these types of use cases since we don't have a comparable offering at all.

Perhaps we could spend a couple of hours as a team running through the basic research that has been done to date, the needs we have identified, and run through different solutions to the problem. It seems like as the distance increases, the amount of knowledge sharing required increases and we have not put enough time towards working through this feature as a broader team.

All thoughts welcome.

Regards,
-scott

On Tue, Feb 1, 2011 at 04:30, Robby Stein <robby@google.com> wrote:
Thanks for the thoughtful questions Guillaume. As Scott and Jonathan mentioned, these are features that we have determined are necessary for Google to provide in order to keep us competitive in this space. The only thing I'll add is that the exact implementation of these features is still open for discussion. The key is just that we want to crystalize what the ideal product is in the market, and then implement a phased strategy to get there while also hitting milestone versions of the feature along the way that will still be used by publishers. That's the tricky balance that we've been very thoughtful about to date. It would be great to discuss in more detail with anyone who'd like to learn more about the background, research and philosophies powering our development to date.

I have some more specific answers to your questions in blue below.

Cheers,
Robby

From: Guillaume Ryder <gryder@google.com>
Date: Tue, 1 Feb 2011 00:28:03 +0000
To: Robby Stein <robby@google.com>
Cc: Michael Guntsch <mgu@google.com>, Jacob Baskin <jbaskin@google.com>, "Yufan Zhu (朱玉凡)" <yzhu@google.com>, Fedor Labounko <fedya@google.com>, Ola Abiri <oabiri@google.com>, Nemo Semret <nemozen@google.com>, Matt Clark <mattclark@google.com>, Bart Govaert <bartgovaert@google.com>, Vincent Zanotti <vzanotti@google.com>, Allan Livingston <allanl@google.com>, Rahul Bafna <rbafna@google.com>, Eyal Manor <emanor@google.com>, Scott Spencer <scottspencer@google.com>, David Singleton <davidsingleton@google.com>, "Clayton Bavor Jr." <cwb@google.com>, Jonathan Bellack <jbellack@google.com>

Subject: Re: Update on AdX YM: Client feedback and Latest Progress

Thanks Robby, it's a very interesting compilation of feedback! Definitely helps to have it organized.

A few questions about the methodology and the raw data, to understand the conclusions better:

- What about non-US publishers? Allan collected some feedback, and there are interesting discrepancies.
  - no mention of reporting at all
  - API support
  - sub-syndication - this has heavy eng implications, since the sub-syndication mechanism is already used as a hack for billing revshare computation purposes; getting rid of the hack will be painful

The scope of this EMEA version was expanded to general publisher feedback, and the US we focused on exactly the three features we are building to get more guidance on how to best implement. I believe we still want to get some EMEA feedback about these tactical features.

- What mocks did we show, or what possible features did we tell the publishers about when asking the questions? For instance, what "reporting dashboard" seems to have a different meaning from a pub to another. It seems to be similar to the current AdX frontend, but I'm not sure. Also, "Pivoted data" seems to be somehow related to it, since a dashboard could show pivoted data. So the question is: what do pubs mean when they say that a dashboard is important? What kind of dashboard are we talking about?

We showed Jacob's dashboard at go/adxdashboard > "Pub stats" and reviewed the top level view. Pubs valued the system wide "vitals" they could use to monitor the business and learn more about how advertisers are valuing them. They also were able to holistically learn how they were making most of their money (i.e. through a specific targeting type, or buyer, etc.). We also showed them the pricing mocks to go/adxym. For "pivoted" data, this was referring to the publisher's ability to mix and max metrics and dimensions to say see revenue, eCPm and imps by geo, site and buyer.

- Just to be sure, can you confirm that "advertiser-level reporting" means "reporting by individual advertisers in each buyer network", or at least "reporting by individual advertisers, possibly across multiple buyer networks"?

Yes -- the publisher wanted to see how much one advertiser was contributing to revenue (ideally across all the networks). This would allow them to see how much money they are making from that adv v. their direct sales team, and could let them make a direct contact with high spenders in the remnant channel.

High-level question: what's our medium- & long-term strategy for managed buys?

As opposed to reporting, where we have a solid plan to catch up and start innovating in 1-2 quarters, and to min RPM optimization, which is 100% innovative, achieving market leadership for managed buys seems to involve significant catch up work.

Publishers seem to express two big needs:

1. Fixed RPM: granularity in managed buys: by-advertiser, caps, priorities, targeting; a bit like DFP line items if I understand correctly.
2. Price optimization: direct deals-aware optimization & reporting engine; i.e. being line items-aware

These two needs can be merged into one: direct deals support centralized in one place, from top-level DFP-like deals to buyer networks managed buys.

Problem: none of this is addressed by the current short-term plan, which will already take a significant amount of time.

Questions:

1. How confident are we that having only simplistic managed buy support for quite some time is going to be enough to contain the yield management issue?

Our goal isn't to completely contain the YM issue with the short term implementation. It will be a step in the right direction, and the goal is that it's still value-add enough to use while demonstrating velocity in this space to keep publishers on AdX.

1. Are we going to change the short-term plan to reduce iteration cost (in particular UX) and achieve the long-term objective earlier?

We are talking about the right way to implement this feature, and if it means holding it to more quickly get to the longer term implementation, then that's certainly an option. However, if we believe that a short term implementation can still be value-add to publishers, then the hypothesis is that we phase in the feature with a design that's extensible and additive -- so as not to replace previous work and much yield larger net development cost.

1. The "Fixed CPM" section of the exec summary looks like the feature set of DFP adapted to AdX terminology. Have we changed the position stated in the mission statement by choosing to re-implement some DFP features into AdX? How far are we willing to go in this direction?

Ultimately, the "Fixed CPM" solution will be one that we will have to provide, but where it lives in the long term is an interesting strategic question. You are right to recognize that many of these features seem more DFP-like, and that's why in the mission statement the long term plan is to build out a more stand-alone yield manager based on XFP, or even provide this as a tab in XFP. The issue is that this is a far longer term plan and so we decided to build initial stop gaps into AdX directly.

Cheers,
Guillaume

On Mon, Jan 31, 2011 at 17:39, Michael <mgu@google.com> wrote:
Hi Robbie,

thanks for the summary and links! Regarding the UX work specifically, I think it will be essential to bring together UI/UX design and the FE eng team, since otherwise the knowledge transfer and feedback loop will be too slow to make the creation of polished mocks in 1-2 weeks feasible (this seems like a stretch goal in any case).

I have already reached out to Sam (samfelder) about coming to LON for a deeper integration, with the goal to bring us forward more quickly. If there is anybody else involved from the UX side that should come over, or if you just want to encourage this to happen more quickly, your help would be much appreciated!

Many thanks,

Michael

On Mon, Jan 31, 2011 at 5:00 PM, Robby Stein <robby@google.com> wrote:
Hi all,

I wanted to send a brief update to the AdX YM leads on where we are with our YM development effort in the US. We've just concluded a 9 client interview period and collected terrific feedback from our most trusted partners. This has provided strong validation for our general approach to this space, and leaves us with some important guidance on how to refine the feature designs. Please take a look at these docs that I've created out of this market feedback sessions:

- **Client feedback Executive Summary**: https://docs.google.com/a/google.com/document/d/1RXBnhAgK8tcWJ_g0tegBcOu1C6U2WHlu3a1-381rPbk/edit#
- **Client feedback aggregated and categorized by feature** (3 sheets): https://spreadsheets1.google.com/a/google.com/ccc?hl=en&key=tF3ijxq7pKc41hmUolSsjtg&hl=en#gid=0

In the Exec Summary, I've provided background for each feature area, and what can be done to give us market parity and then leadership in each space.

Beyond the client reviews, we've also concluded:

- Eng reviews for analytics in NY (when the LON team visited) so pipelines could begin dev.
- Eng reviews for managed networks (where we are discussing how to adapt the BE design to the client feedback). Updated design forthcoming...
- UX review for all three features, where we spent 2 days ramping the team up on the needs of adx clients. They met with clients, sales etc. to become experts.
- UX initial directions/design for managed networks
- UX first explorations into reporting (incorporating client feedback)

All documentation, initial mocks etc. can be found at go/adxym

Next steps for us are:

- Connect UX with LON eng this week around initial UX directions to discuss feasibly, then produce polished mocks for each feature in 1-2 weeks.
- Connect the US-based client feedback with Europe to form global market outlook.
- Use client feedback to lock BE design decisions
- Overhaul the PRDs with the latest information from design docs, new UX, and client feedback -- and include strategic approach with these features in terms of what will be built now v. later.

Please let me know if you have any questions at this point. We are trying to continue moving quickly, and hope the next few weeks will allow us to lock mocks, BE designs, and strategic plan for how we will phase some of these features.

-Robby

--
Robby Stein | Product Manager | Google, Inc. | robby@google.com | 212-565-9343 |

--
Dr. Michael Guntsch
Google UK, London, Desk 488A
Tel: 00 44 207 184 3320
GPG Key Fingerprint:
8495 D217 4563 7A3C 869C 4EB2 770A B48D 39B3 9DD9
"True communication is possible only between equals, because inferiors are more consistently rewarded for telling their superiors pleasant lies than for telling the truth."

--
Robby Stein | Product Manager | Google, Inc. | robby@google.com | 212-565-9343 |